

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10-12, 15, 17, and 20-24 are amended, claim 19 is cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-17, and 20-24 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the remarks and amendments presented  
5 herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Applicant makes no representation that the cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any cited references are prior  
10 art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

### **Rejections under § 103**

15 Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-12, 15-16 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028610 to Pearson (“Pearson”), in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0050976 to Block, et al. (“Block”), and further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0068524 to Aboulhosn, et al.  
20 (“Aboulhosn”), and still further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0034070 to Meir, et al. (“Meir”).

Claims 17, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn.

25 Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Block, Aboulhosn and Meir, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0243672 to Markki, et al. (“Markki”).

## The Claims

**Independent claim 1** is amended, and as amended recites [added language is indicated in underline] a computer storage medium comprising computer executable code that is executable by a computing device to cause to be displayed  
5 a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface comprising:

- a group space associated with a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the group space comprising a first display area for providing an appearance of a shared file location which the group member and the at least one other member of the group may access;
- a first control located in a second display area selectable by the first member to select at least one task associated with the group space and to activate one or more operations with respect to files displayed in the first display area, such that the at least one other member of the group is automatically shown the result of the one or more operations performed with respect to the files displayed in the first display area;
- a selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first member of the group, the group member list including a plurality of group members, an indication field of a role for each of the plurality of group members, and one or more indications reflecting whether each of the plurality of group members is currently online;
- a second control located in the second display area, the second control including a drop-down menu selectable by the first member of the group for defining one of a plurality of roles for the at least one other member of the group;
- a visual indication that identifies instances of content as new content based on the instances of content being added or changed within a predetermined period of time; and
- a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Meir. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has

amended claim 1 to clarify its recited subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references for at least the reason that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1.

For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the features of (emphasis added):

- a visual indication that identifies instances of content as new content based on the instances of content being added or changed within a predetermined period of time; and
- a third control allowing selection by the first member of the group of the predetermined period of time to be used to identify the instances of content as new content.

In the Office Action, the Office argues that:

Meir expressly teaches ... an indication of new content, wherein new content comprises files added or changed within a predetermined period of time, and a third control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time (fig. 5; [0057]: an indication of updating the file lists upon arrival of the new files based on the time intervals that a user selects). Office Action at page 6.

To aid in this discussion, paragraph [0057] of Meir is excerpted below.

The number of the current files stored in the input storage region 15 is displayed in the uppermost line 19 in the input window 20. These 40 files are shown in the example of FIG. 3 with one page per. As is recognizable using the file nomenclature of the input files, the total newspaper is comprised of exactly 40 pages (compare the last number of the file name before the ending "PDF"). In the indicated cast, all files have already arrived. In order to automatically update the file lists upon arrival of the new files, a hook can be set in the input window 18 (autorefresh), and the time intervals are set in second-precise manner between the individual updating events. Meir at paragraph [0057].

First, this section of Meir simply indicates that “in order to automatically update the file lists upon arrival of the new files, a hook can be set in the input window 18 (autorefresh), and the time intervals are set in second-precise manner between the individual updating events.” Thus, Meir discusses an “autorefresh” function that can update an “input window” based on the “arrival of new files.” Meir further discusses that “time intervals are set in second-precise manner between the individual updating events.” Nowhere does Meir teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 1 is allowable.

**Claims 2-8 and 10-12** depend from claim 1 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

**Claims 3 and 4** depend from claim 1 and stand rejected as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Meir and still further in view of Markki. As discussed above, however, a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 cannot be established based on the combination of Pearson, Block, Aboulhosn, and Meir. The addition of Markki fails to remedy the deficiencies of Pearson, Block, Aboulhosn, and Meir. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 4 are allowable.

**Independent claim 15** is amended, and as amended recites [added language is indicated in underline] a computer storage medium comprising computer executable code that is executable by a computing device to cause to be displayed a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface comprising:

- a first shared space display area for a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the first shared space display area being configured to receive a drop of a file icon and further

being configured to, responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area, cause the file icon to become visible in a different graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group,

- 5       • wherein a shared file associated with the file icon may be retrieved by selecting the file icon, and wherein the first shared space display area includes at least one visible task item selectable by the first member of the group to activate an operation to be performed with respect to the first shared space display area;
- 10       • a selectable indicator for visually presenting a list of members of the group to the first member of the group, the list of members of the group including an indication field of a role for each member in the list of members of the group, the list of members of the group also including indicia reflecting, for each member of the group, whether the member of the group is currently connected to a network associated with the group; and
- 15       • a control for selecting one of a plurality of roles for the at least one other member of the group.

20       Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn and still further in view of Meir. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 15 to clarify its recited subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be

25       established based on the cited combination of references for at least the reason that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 15.

First, in support of its rejection of claim 15, the Office simply states that “[t]he subject matter recited in Claims 15, 23 and 24 corresponds to the subject

30       matter recited in Claim 1. Thus Pearson, in view of Block, Aboulhosn and Meir, discloses every limitation of Claims 15, 23 and 24, as indicated in the above rejections for Claim 1.” Office Action at page 9. Applicant objects to this characterization of claims 1, 15, 23, and 24, and submits that these claims differ in both the subject matter recited and their scope in several respects.

Second, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references for at least the reason that the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the feature of (emphasis added):

- a first shared space display area for a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group, the first shared space display area being configured to receive a drop of a file icon and further being configured to, responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area, cause the file icon to become visible in a different graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group.

In its rejection of dependent claim 12, the Office argues that:

Pearson further teaches ... computer executable code for displaying an indication of a file dropped by the first member whereby a notification corresponding to the indication is automatically transmitted to the at least one other online group member ([0035]: indication of file receiving from a first member through a checklist used to keep track of requested file by other members). Office Action at pages 8 and 9.

This section of Pearson, however, simply discusses a technique for “transferring a file from one or more host computers on which the file is stored to a further host computer at which a user requested the file....” Pearson at paragraph [0035]. As part of this technique, a “map of file segments making up the file” is generated. Id. As part of the map of file segments is a “checklist used to keep track of which file segments of a requested file have been received and which have not.” Id. Nowhere, however, does Pearson teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 15, particularly with respect to the feature of “responsive to the drop of the file icon in the first shared space display area, cause the file icon to become visible in a different graphical user interface associated with the at least one other member of the group.”

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 15 is allowable.

5       **Claim 16** depends from claim 15 and thus is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

**Independent claim 17** is amended, and as amended recites a method comprising [added language is indicated in underline]:

10

- displaying to a first user via a first user display a group folder object having associated therewith a first selectable task for forming a group ;
- transmitting a request to join the group by sending a communication over a network to a computing device associated with at least one other user to initiate a group communication session between the first user and the at least one other user;
- receiving from the computing device associated with the at least one other user a response to the request, the response including a unique numeric identifier associated with the at least one other user;
- displaying a first selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first user, the group member list including an indication field of a role for each of the members in the group member list and indicia reflecting for each member of the group whether the member of the group is currently connected to the network; and
- displaying a second selectable indicator that is selectable to select between a first mode in which files from a group space associated with the group are copied to the computing device associated with the at least one other user in response to a demand for the files from the at least one other user, and a second mode in which files from the group space are automatically copied to the computing device associated with the at least one other user in response to the files being added to the group space.

15

20

25

30

35       Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pearson in view of Block and further in view of Aboulhosn. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 17 to clarify its recited subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of

obviousness with respect to claim 17 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references for at least the reason that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 17.

5 For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the features of (emphasis added):

- displaying a second selectable indicator that is selectable to select  
10 between a first mode in which files from a group space associated with  
the group are copied to the computing device associated with the at least  
one other user in response to a demand for the files from the at least one  
other user, and a second mode in which files from the group space are  
automatically copied to the computing device associated with the at  
15 least one other user in response to the files being added to the group  
space.

In the Office Action, the Office argues that:

20 Pearson further teaches ... receiving an input selecting between (a) a first mode in which files in the group space are copied to the computing device used by the at least one other user on an on-demand basis and (b) a second mode in which files in the shared space are replicated to the computer device used by the at least one other user when the files are added to the group space (figs. 22-29; [0057]-[0058]). Office Action at  
25 pages 13 and 14.

A review of these sections of Pearson, and in fact the entirety of the reference, can find no mention of the above-mentioned feature of claim 17. The cited sections of Pearson simply discuss ways in which files can be added or  
30 deleted from a “shared files list”. Nowhere, however, does Pearson teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 17.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 17 cannot be established based on the cited combination of references and claim 17 is allowable.



